| UNITED ST | TATES | DISTRI | CT CC | DURT |
|-----------|--------|--------|-------|------|
| WESTERN | DISTRI | CT OF | NEW | YORK |

HDI-GERLING AMERICA INSURANCE COMPANY, as successor in interest to Gerling America Insurance Company,

Civil Action No.

Plaintiff-Respondent,

State Court Index No.: I2010-008710

-against-

NOTICE OF REMOVAL

LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,

| Defendant-Petitioner. | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| MET THAT AND | X | | | |

MADAMS/SIRS:

M.V.itigationV.IBERTYWDI-Gerling/Notice of Removal doc

Defendant-Petitioner LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY

("Liberty Mutual"), by its attorneys, JAFFE & ASHER LLP, respectfully alleges as follows:

- 1. On or about August 23, 2010, Liberty Mutual was served with a Summons and Complaint in an action entitled <u>HDI-Gerling America Insurance Company</u>, as successor in interest to Gerling America Insurance Company v. Liberty Mutual Insurance Company, Index No. I-2010-8710, which was commenced on August 13, 2010 in the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Erie.
- 2. The Complaint asserts two causes of action. The first cause of action seeking a declaratory judgment regarding Liberty Mutual obligation to defend and indemnify plaintiff-respondent HDI-GERLING AMERICA INSURANCE COMPANY's ("HDI") insured, New York State Thruway Authority, for an underlying action brought by R.L. Floyd. The second cause of action seeks recovery of previously incurred defense

costs. A copy of the Summons and Complaint is annexed hereto as Exhibit "1".

- 3. A index of all documents filed in the State Court action is annexed hereto as Exhibit "2".
- 4. The Notice of Removal is being filed by Liberty Mutual within thirty (30) days of the service of the Summons and Complaint and is timely filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1441, 1446.
- 5. Liberty Mutual's time to move, answer, or otherwise respond to the Complaint has not expired.
- 6. This Court has original jurisdiction over this civil action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332; the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000.00 and plaintiff and defendant are citizens of different states.
- 7. Upon information and belief, at all relevant times, HDI was, and still is, a corporation duly organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, with its principal place of business located at 150 N. Wacker Drive, 29th Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60606.
- 8. At all relevant times, Liberty Mutual was, and still is, a stock insurance company organized under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with its principal place of business located at 175 Berkeley Street, Boston, Massachusetts.
- 9. Written notice of the filing of the Notice of Removal shall be given to adverse parties, and Liberty Mutual shall file the notice with the Clerk of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, County of Erie, as required by law.
- 10. Liberty Mutual has not answered, moved, or otherwise responded to the Complaint, and no other proceedings have occurred heretofore in this action.

11. No previous application for the relief requested herein has heretofore been made.

WHEREFORE, defendant-petitioner Liberty Mutual respectfully requests that this action be removed to this Court.

Dated:

New York, New York September 10, 2010

Yours, etc.,

JAFFE & ASHER LLP

By:

Marshall T. Potashner, Esq. Attorneys for Defendant-Petitioner LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE **COMPANY**

600 Third Avenue, 9th Floor New York, New York 10016 (212) 687-3000

EXHIBIT 1

STATE OF NEW YORK SUPREME COURT: ERIE COUNTY

HDI-GERLING AMERICA INSURANCE COMPANY, as successor in interest to Gerling America Insurance Company,

Plaintiff,

Index No: Take

T.

-23-16 LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE 13 Riverside Road

Weston, MA 02493

Defendants.

To the above-named Diffendant:

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED to answer the Complaint in this ac an and to series a copy of your Answer, or, if the Complaint is not served with a Summons, to serve a Notice of Appearance, on the plaintiffs attorneys within twenty (20) days after the service of this Summons, exclusive of the day of service, or within thirty (30) days after the service is complete if this Summons is not personally delivered to you within the State of New York. In case of your failure to appear or ar wer, judgment will be taken against you by default for the relief demanded in the Complaint.

e is designion made by Erie County is designated as the place of trial. The basis of the

plaintiff.

DATED:

Buffalo, New York August 12, 2010

KENNEY SHELTON LIPTAR NOWAK LL?

4/3

s J/Doggan, Esq Attorneys for Plaintiff Suite 510 Rand Buildin, 14 Lafayette Square

Buffalo, New York 14203

(716) 853-3801

STATE OF NEW YORK
SUPREME COURT: ERIE COUNTY

HDI-GERLING AMERICA INSURANCE COMPANY, as successor in interest to Gerling America Insurance Company,

Plaintiff,

COMPLA NO.

LIBERTY MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,

40. J

Defendants.

Plaintiff HDI-Gerling America Insurance Company, as succe sor in interestor to Gerling America Insurance Company, ("HDI-Gerling") by and three no its attory as Kenney Shelton Liptak Nowak LLP, for its complaint in this act representation and belief:

- HDI-Gerling is an Illinois corporation authorized to transact certain insurance business in New York.
- 2. Liberty Musual Insurance Company ("Liberty") is a Massachusetts corporation authorized to transact certain insurance business in New Yo
- 3. On or about August 18, 1997, The New York State I suway Authority ("NYSTA") entered into a written agreement with KTA-Tator Engineering, r.C. ("KTA") entitled "Engineering Agreement For Construction Inspection" ("the agreement") in connection with the cleaning and painting of the Grand Island Bridge ("the project").

08/13/2010/ 15:07:4
ERIE COUNTY CLERK
RCPT # 934738

- 4. Pursuant to the agreement, KTA was obligated to proceed general liability insurance with coverage for bodily injury liability and property damage liability with limits of liability of at least \$1 million, and name NYSTA as an insured under the liability policy.
- 5. Liberty issued a commercial general liability policy to KTA (Policies'o. YY7-181-015293-119/8) for the period May 14, 1999 to May 14, 2000 ("the policy"), which provided additional insured coverage to NYSTA for bodily injury liability.
- 6. Pursuant to the agreement, KTA was also obligated to procure protective liability insurance for the benefit of NYSTA.
- 7. Liberty issued KTA an owners and contractors' protec; we liability process (Policy No. TF1-181-015293-357) in effect on September 27, 1995 which iden and NYSTA as an insured ("the OCP policy"), and provided coverage to the STA for bodily injury liability.
- 8: HDI-Gerling issued an Owners and Contractors Protective Liability policy to The People of the State of New York in effect on September 27, 1959 ("the Gerling policy)".
- 9. On September 27, 1999, R.L. Floyd ("Floyd") was alleg dy injured le in the course of his work on the project (the "underlying accident").
- 10. In or about November 2001, Floyd commenced an action against NYTA in the New York Court of Claims captioned R.L. Floyd v. New York State Thruway Authority, (Claim No. 10526) (the "underlying action") seeking damages in connection with his alleged injuries sustained as a result of the underlying accident

33, S

- The complaint in the underlying action alleges, in er alia, orderary 11. negligence based upon tortious acts by KTA.
- 12. Given that NYSTA is an insured under the Gerling policy, HDI-Gerling retained and paid counsel to defend NYSTA in connection with the to derlying account and action.
- As part of its defense to the underlying action, NYS commence, an 13. action against KTA in New York Supreme Court, Erie County, captened New Work State Thruway Authority v. KTA-Tator Engineering Services, Inc., (Index No. I-2004-1115) ("the NYSTA-KTA action") seeking contribution and indemnification in connection with the underlying accident and action.
- 14. Upon information and belief the underlying action and the NYSTAaction remain pending.
- HDI-Gerling timely tendered NYSTA's defense in connection with the 15. underlying accident, claim, and suit(s) to Liberty under the OCP policy.
- 16. By letter dated February 16, 2006, Liberty acknowledged that NYSTA was an insured under the OCP policy but disclaimed any obligation to defend or indemnify NYSTA under the OCP policy in connection with the underlying acciount, claim or suit(s).
- 17. HDI-Gerling timely tendered NYSTA's defense in cc aection with the underlying accident, claim, and suit(s) to Liberty under the CGL policy.
- 18. By letter dated April 16, 2008, Liberty disclaimed any obligation to defend or indemnify NYSTA in connection with the underlying accident, claim or suit(s) under the CGL policy, based upon the CGL policy's exclusion tived, "Exclusion -

6.3

Engineers, Architects of Surveyors Professional Liability Engorsement" ("the professional liability exclusion").

- 19. The professional liability exclusion is limited to bodily injury liability arising out of the rendering or failure to render professional services by KTA.
- 20. The exclusion defines professional services to include (1) "preparing, approving, or failing to prepare or approve, maps, shop drawings, opinions, reports, surveys, field orders, change orders or drawings and specifications" and (2) "supervisory, inspection, architectural or engineering activities."
- 21. As a result of Liberty's wrongful denial of coverage NYSTA, HDI-Gerling paid, and continues to pay for NYSTA's defense costs.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION

- 22. HDI-Gerling repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 22 as if fully set forth herein.
- 23. As an insured under the OCP policy, NYSTA is entitled to covera, in connection with the underlying action and the NYSTA-KTA action.
- 24. Liberty's February 16, 2006 letter disclaiming any obligation to defer 6 or indemnify NYSTA under the OCP policy in connection with the underlying accident, claim or suit(s) was untimely, improper and failed to comply with the requirements set forth in Insurance Law § 3420(d).
- 25. As a result of Liberty's wrongful denial of coverage and NYSTA, I. Gerling paid, and continues to pay, for NYSTA's defense costs.

Pursuant to the OCP policy, Liberty must reimburse HDI-Gerlin for 26. NYSTA's defense costs in connection with the underlying action and NYSTA-NYSTA action.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

- 27. HDI-Gerling repeats and realleges paragraphs 1 through 26 as if fully set forth herein.
- As an additional insured under the CGL policy, NYSTA is entit! * to 28. coverage in connection with the underlying action and the NYSTA-KT. Section.
- 29. Liberty's April 16, 2008 letter disclaiming any obliga on to defend or indemnify NYSTA in connection with the underlying accident, claim or suit(s) under the CGL policy improperly relied upon the CGL policy's professional liability exclusion.
- 30. The professional liability exclusion only excludes bodily injury liability arising out of the rendering or failure to render professional services by &TA.
- 31. The professional liability exclusion does not apply to the egations in the underlying action's complaint for ordinary negligence based upon tortuc is acts by KTA.
- 32. As a result of Liberty's wrongful denial of coverage to NYSTA, HDI-Gerling paid, and continues to pay, for NYSTA's defense costs.
- 33. Pursuant to the CGL policy, Liberty must reimburse HDI-Gerling for NYSTA's defense costs in connection with the underlying action and the NYSTA-ITTA action.

€

WHEREFORE, HDI-Gerling America Insurance Company demands judent declaring that Liberty is obligated to (1) defend and/or indemnify N A in connection with the underlying accident, claim, and suit(s), (2) reimburse HDI-Gerling for NYSTA's defense costs already expended, and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper, together with the costs and disbursements of this action.

Dated: August 12, 2010

KENNEY SHELTON LIPTAK 1 DWAK LLF

James J. Duggar

510 Rand Building 14 Lafayette Square Buffalo, New York 14203 Tel.: (716) 853-3801

Attorneys for plaintiff HDI-Gerling America Insurance Company

EXHIBIT 2

INDEX OF DOCUMENTS FILED IN STATE COURT ACTION

- 1. Summons -- Filed August 13, 2010
- 2. Complaint Filed August 13, 2010